



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

NEW LITERATURE ON THE SEPTUAGINT¹

The appearance of a second Part of the larger Cambridge Septuagint² is of interest for several reasons. It comes soon after the first Part, and it remarks that the preparation of the notes on Numbers and Deuteronomy will not furnish so many difficulties as in this portion where it was necessary to meet the difficulties connected with the Hexaplaric text of the later chapters of Exodus. There are two small modifications, one of them of great importance, of the scheme carried out in the first Part. The symbol b now denotes the readings of the closely related MSS 108 and 19 (Holmes-Parsons): Where they differ, 19 is denoted by b¹, 118 by b. The New Testament evidence has been more fully presented. In cases where the first hand of B (B*) stands almost alone, and one or both of the correctors' hands (known as B^a, B^b) have introduced a reading which is supported by almost all the other authorities, the editors have usually given the latter the preference in their text. They have done so because they were thus able considerably to shorten and simplify their notes. They might have done so even more frequently, though it is no part of their task to construct a true text of the LXX. For it is incredible how frequently the merest blunders of the copyist of B have been adduced as "the LXX," merely because they are printed in the text of the smaller and now also in the larger Cambridge Septuagint. The margins of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* are full of such rubbish. A few examples from Exodus may be quoted:

No MS of the LXX except B writes ῥήματα instead of σημεία at 4:28, but Ryssel-Kittel quote "Ὁ τὰ ῥήματα."

No MS of the LXX except B has 435 years instead of 430 in 12:40, 41 but Ryssel-Kittel state: "Ⲭ+ⲓⲙⲉⲧⲓⲛⲓⲁⲓ (cf. Gen. 12:4; 21:5; 25:26; 47:9) Exod. 12:41, Ⲭ+ⲓⲙⲉⲧⲓⲛⲓⲁⲓ, ut 40."

¹ See *American Journal of Theology*, XIII (July, 1909), 446-50.

² *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus*. Supplemented from Other Uncial Manuscripts, with a Critical Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint. Edited by ALAN ENGLAND BROOKE, B.D., AND NORMAN MCLEAN, M.A. Vol. I, "The Octateuch," Part II, Exodus and Leviticus. Cambridge: The University Press, 1909. viii+155+405 pages. 12s. 6d. net.

No MS of the LXX except B has at 32:14 περιποιῆσαι τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ instead of περὶ τῆς κακίας ἧς εἶπεν ποιῆσαι τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; but Ryssel-Kittel deem this blunder of B worthy to be quoted, and place before every reader of this Hebrew Bible the riddle to reconcile this Greek with the Hebrew. In two of these three cases the new editors have now changed the text of Swete (=B), but not in the first. As I said, they might have done so in many more cases, and I am glad to see that this principle is approved in the important notice of the first part published by Ernst Hautsch in the *Göttinger gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1909, pp. 563–80. The same reviewer compared the collations of seven Vatican MSS from photographs in the possession of the Septuagint undertaking of the Royal Society of Göttingen, and found them very accurate, while those of Holmes-Parsons needed many corrections and additions. For the present Part and notice, I compared the whole of Exodus with Thompson's photographic reproduction of the Codex Alexandrinus, with these results:

7:17: The reading μεταβασιλῆ instead of μεταβαλεῖ is marked in the MS as a mistake; so likewise 15:21, ἀναβάτηρ instead of ἀναβάτην.

12:29: A has ἀπὸ πρωτόκου (haplography).

20:6: A omits the ν ἐφελκυστικόν in φυλάσσουνσι, and in 28:12, εἰσί.

20:8, 12, 15: The numbering of the ten commandments on the margins of A is not given (see on this strange omission, *The Expository Times*).

23:4: A has here the spelling ἐκχθροῦ.

29:38: After τὴν ἡμέραν A has ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας; see Swete.

33:17: A* has had τῶ, i. e., τὸν instead of τοῦτον.

36:34: A has, like γ, the reading τὸ λῶμα instead of τοῦ λώματος; see Swete.

36:39: I do not think that A has ἐντετυπωμένα; I believe the second letter to be κ.

In the subscription it would have been well to state that the MS joins the article and the preposition with the following nouns, writing ἐξοδὸς τῶν νιῶν ἡλ ἐξαιγύπτου.

In the apparatus at 12:10 A is quoted on the wrong side, i. e., for καταλιπ—instead of for the rival reading καταλειπ—. Surely, if all other collations, which I cannot compare, are of the same accuracy, we have every reason to be satisfied.

As to the *quotations from ancient writers*, E. Hautsch has shown that they are sometimes too short and therefore liable to mislead. But this is unavoidable, where space forbids a special investigation and discussion of quotations. As examples I may discuss one from the New Testament and one from Philo:

In Exod. 32:28, in the narrative on the golden calf, the received text gives 3,000 as the number of slain Israelites. As variations B-M quote: *εἴκοσι τρεῖς χιλιάδες ἀνδρῶν*, r *℣*^{wz} (*vid.*): *χιλιάδες τρεῖς καὶ εἴκοσιν*, Cyr.-ed.: *χιλιάδες εἴκοσι τρεῖς*, Cyr. cod.: *χιλιάδες τρεῖς*, Cyr. cod. Before vs. 6 they had quoted from the New Testament, I Cor. 10:7, but here they fail to quote the sequel, vs. 8, "and fell in one day three and twenty thousand"; of course because they see in it a reference to Num. 24:9, "twenty and four thousand." Likewise they omit a quotation from Philo, V, 186 (ed. of Cohn-Wendland), *τέσσαρες πρὸς τοῖς εἴκοσι*. But both passages, that of Philo and that of Paul, especially the latter with its 23,000, refer also to Exod., chap. 32, like the quotation from Cyril.

But I must cut short the discussion of detail. The praises given in the first notice to printers and publishers and to the care of revising must be repeated; some misprints I have corrected in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*. One desideratum is that the publishers might add to the next part a book-marker with the list of symbols, like those in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* or in my Greek Testaments; at present everyone is obliged to turn to the first part, if he has forgotten the meaning of one of the symbols.

And now some gleanings from the rich apparatus. The mountain of the law, which we are now accustomed to call *Sinai*, but which we ought to call *Sinā*, is spelled *Σιναι* consistently through Exodus and Leviticus only in the MS *r*, and in Leviticus (not in Exodus) in *g*. Where did this spelling originate? And does the difference in *g* prove the work of two different copyists? Examples of the *Iota adscriptum* are found in A, Exod. 28:28; 36:31. Or does the spelling *ωια* hint at a pronunciation *ōia* (with *diaeresis*)? By the way, this *diaeresis* ought to appear in the word *ῥοίσκος*, where the ending is long; compare 36:33, *ῥοίσκων*, which might be read as a diphthong, with *ῥοίσκος*, vs. 34. In the latter form the *diaeresis* is not necessary, the accent marking the pronunciation. The Hebrew *shekel* is spelt *σίγκλος* instead of *σίγκλος* in *x* everywhere in Exodus (7 times), and in 39:7 this spelling is presupposed by the misrendering *columnae* of the Bohairic translation. The copyist of the Old Latin introduces "Pompejus" into the law for the day of expiation, Lev. 16:8, *ad dimissionem pompeio*. In the same law the Greek MSS might be classified by the use of *χίμαρος* and *τράγος*.

Very important is the agreement of A, not only with *y*, but also with *b* and *w*; compare Exod. 38:8, 11, 12, 22; 39:1; 40:7; Lev. 7:2. For this agreement shows that the MS A or its ancestor stood under the influence of Lucian; a most welcome evidence for the theory of von Soden concerning the New Testament part of this MS.

A special study might be made of the passages in which numbers occur. In which way are the numbers written, by figures or letters? And how are the variations to be explained which are found there? For instance, in Exod. 37:13 the MSS Bah have ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα, all the rest have πέντε καὶ δέκα (d ιε) *I^w decem*. How did B come to have the number 150?

In 39:1 we find εἴκοσι Bah; καὶ εἴκοσι (iqux); τριάκοντα p^{II}; καὶ τριάκοντα all the rest except 71, which has καὶ τριακόσια. In 39:4, B alone repeats ἑκατὸν, which is omitted by all other witnesses. On 12:40, 41 (B alone + πέντε), on 32:38 (3,000 or 23,000 or 24,000) see above.

To the notice of the first Part I was able to add the notice of a *Grammar of the Septuagint* (by Helbing; see p. 448); it is now a still greater pleasure to supplement this notice of the second part with a word about a second grammar of the Old Testament in Greek, which is in every respect superior to the former, that of Thackeray.³ It is the work of the very limited leisure time of a public official during the last eight years, but it embodies the most thoroughgoing collations and researches. In the Introduction the editor dwells on the classification of the various translations and translators united in the Septuagint; then he adduces reasons which seem to prove that not only for the work of translation, but also for the task of copying, a single book was intrusted to different hands. As to the two translators of Jeremiah, he comes now to the same results as Köhler (see *American Journal of Theology*, July, 1909, p. 449) apparently without knowing him. As to his remarks on Ezekiel (pp. ii, 139; Ez. α writes ἐπιγνώσονται διότι ἐγὼ κύριος where Ez. β has γνώσονται ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος), we may mention a special paper devoted to this question.⁴ Very careful are his observations on the question as to how closely we can argue from the orthography and language of our great uncials to that of the autographs. He finds, for instance, a decided contrast in the use of the declension of μάχαῖρα between the Septuagint and the New Testament, and says (p. 142):

The contrast between the LXX and the N.T. is instructive and indicates the value of the uncial evidence. Whereas we have seen that in the LXX there are only 2 undisputed instances of the η form out of 79, in the N.T. μάχαῖρη (ης) are read by WH in all the 8 passages where the cases occur; and almost exclusive use of the η forms is found in other N.T. words on ρα (WH ed. Vol. II, App., p. 163).

³ *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. By Henry St. John Thackeray, M.A. Vol. I, "Introduction, Orthography and Accidence." Cambridge: The University Press, 1909. xx+325 pages. 8s.

⁴ Schäfers, *Ist das Buch Ezechiel in der Septuaginta von einem oder mehreren Dolmetschern übersetzt?* ("Theologie und Glaube," 1909, 3.)

This distinction between O.T. and N.T. is borne out by the papyri, which show that it is one of time not of country (Egypt and Palestine). The η forms are absent from papyri of the third century B.C.; examples of words in $\rho\alpha$ begin at the close of the second century B.C. with $\delta\lambda\upsilon\rho\eta\varsigma$ (118 B.C.), $\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\lambda\eta\varsigma$ (η) (114 and 112 B.C.). On the other hand, under the early Empire these forms are practically universal.

For some of these questions it would have been agreeable to have the examples in tabulated form from the whole of these uncials, Old Testament and New Testament together; it would then be easier to decide whether these observations are really borne out by the facts. Take the question of $\pi\hat{\alpha}\nu$ for $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$ (pp. 173-75):

There are a number of instances in the LXX where $\pi\hat{\alpha}\nu$ appears to be used for $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$ (acc. sing.). A solitary example of this use of $\pi\hat{\alpha}\nu$ in the papyri rescues it from the suspicion of being a "Biblical" usage.

In a note (p. 175) we learn:

This use of $\pi\hat{\alpha}\nu$ appears clearly to go back to the translator or an early scribe of Ezekiel α ; Ez β on the other hand writes $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$.

But nowhere are we informed whether it occurs outside the LXX, say, in the New Testament or elsewhere.⁵

It seems a pity that Thackeray did not treat the Greek Bible as a whole, including the N.T. Still what he has given us is very satisfactory. We look forward to the second volume with great interest. I mention some smaller contributions by Burkitt,⁶ Dahse,⁷ Ruelle⁸.

With the negative part of Burkitt's paper I fully agree, namely that Lucian's $\xi\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$ has not preserved the original text (יְהִי כְרוֹן) and that $\epsilon\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\rho\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu$ of ז cannot be יְהִי כְרוֹן ; but the conjectural restoration of the original Hebrew text of Solomon's invocation I cannot accept ("Sun, shine forth in heaven!" and "I have indeed built thee a celestial palace. For Thy dwelling at the New Moon Feasts," or "For Sabbaths and for New Moon Feasts.") I fully agree again with the general remarks on the text-critical value of the recensions of Lucian and B. Burkitt's closing words are: "Very few

⁵ Cf. my reference (*American Journal of Theology*, July, 1909) to the Psalms of Solomon 3:10; 8:23, Cod. V.

⁶ "The Lucianic Text of I Kings 8:53^b," *Journal of Theological Studies*, April, 1909, X, 39, 439-45.

⁷ "Zur Herkunft des alttestamentlichen Textes der Aldina," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXIX, 1909, 177-85.

⁸ "Un passage des Septante dans le Parisinus 2841, en partie palimpseste," *Revue de philologie et d'histoire anciennes*, Avril-Juillet, 1909.

scholars have realized till lately the terrible extent to which the text of B is disfigured by unskilful sporadic correction from the Hexapla."

Dahse's paper is not quite conclusive as to the questions which it investigates, because he was not able to go to Venice to compare the new MSS, to which he calls attention. My own wrong results about the origin of the MSS H-P 31 and 83 were due to working only with the materials to be found in Holmes-Parsons and Lagarde. I was not aware that there were other MSS of the Septuagint at Venice. It appears now to me a great pity that the MSS Ven. 15 and Ven. 534 have not been allowed to contribute to the larger Cambridge Septuagint. I can but indorse the hope expressed by Dahse, that a new collation of the MSS at Venice will finally settle the question. At present I am not yet fully convinced that I was wrong. If one of the MSS mentioned has $\tau\eta\ \delta\chi\theta\eta$ (Gen. 41:2, 18) for $\tau\psi\ \alpha\chi\epsilon\iota$, and $\iota\delta\omicron\nu\ \alpha\lambda\eta\lambda\omicron\iota$ for $\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\iota\alpha\delta\eta\lambda\omicron\iota$, I was wrong and the origin of this part of the Aldina is determined. Who will help to settle the matter?

Perhaps the help may come from Göttingen. Lagarde has not worked in vain. As evidence we may quote two short pages.⁹ They are signed "Die Commission für das Septuaginta-Unternehmen," and tell that in 1907 Professor Rahlfs, developed a provisional plan for a scientific edition of the Septuagint to be edited by the help of the Academy of Berlin, the Royal Society of Göttingen, and the Prussian Ministerium of Instruction. The work began with the collection of all manuscripts in Greek, Coptic, Ethiopic, Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, Georgian, and Slavonic. The Latin MSS are left to the Pontifical Commission for Revising the Vulgate. After the MSS come the Church Fathers. Dr. Hautsch, whose notice of the larger Cambridge Septuagint I mentioned above, has gone through Theodoret's *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*, to ascertain the biblical text used by that father. Finally, communications were opened with some scholars abroad that suggest good prospects for the future. The undersigned can but entertain the hope that these arrangements will also include the leaders of the Cambridge undertaking, that both may help each other. What an encouraging outlook!

A most important textual publication is that on Ecclesiasticus which we owe to J. H. A. Hart and The Cambridge University Press.¹⁰ It has a long history. From photographs provided by the Hort Fund the text of

⁹ "Erster Bericht über das Septuaginta-Unternehmen" (Berichtjahr 1908), *Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*. (Geschäftliche Mitteilungen, 1909, Heft 1.)

¹⁰ *Ecclesiasticus*. The Greek Text of Codex 248 edited with Textual Commentary and Prolegomena. By J. H. A. Hart, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Cambridge: The University Press, 1909. xviii + 378 pages. 10s. net.

this MS (Vat. 346; in the present edition, pp. 1-71) was printed in the year 1900 and by the kindness of the editor and the assent of the Pitt Press, I was able to make use of it for the article "Sirach" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (see Vol. IV, 1902, especially p. 544a). Then the editor compared the Syro-Hexaplar with the Text of B (here pp. 73-88). It would have been convenient if he had marked those readings of the Syriac version which agree with 248. Then follows in the present book a Textual Commentary, pp. 89-228, printed in September, 1903; and finally the Prolegomena, pp. 231-370, in which Hart attempts to prove that the "book was written and translated before the date commonly assigned to it; that in its fullest form the Greek version contains primitive but specifically Pharisaic teaching, and that the ancestor of the uncial manuscripts formed part of such a work as Origen's Hexapla." This last sentence, quoted from the Preface (p. ix) shows the importance of the book, especially of its last part. In the Textual Commentary, also, many emendations are proposed for the Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and Syriac texts which must not be overlooked. A curious omission is in the fact that Hart nowhere states that his MS 248 was the basis of the Complutensian Polyglot, and that from this source most of the additions to the text of Ecclesiasticus, which are contained in Codex 248, came into the version of 1611 A.D., and were then excluded from the R.V. on the strength of the chief uncials (cf. pp. 272 f.). These additions are "fragments of the *Wisdom of a Scribe of the Pharisees* and contain tentative Greek renderings of many of the technical terms and watchwords of the sect" (p. 279). Under headings such as "Accuracy," "Nobility," "Reception and Rejection," "Repentance," "The Promise," "Hope," "The World Which Is to Come," "Recompense," "Fear and Love of God," "Glory," "Things Indifferent," the contents of these additions are discussed. There follows a special chapter on "The Quotations of Clement of Alexandria" (pp. 321-45); and finally, a chapter on the "Conflict of the Rival Greek Versions" (pp. 346-70), in which it is shown that the text of the four great uncials goes back to Origen; while that of the cursives, especially that of 248, was used by Clement and later writers. The title Ἐκκλησιαστικός given to the book in this manuscript is still unparalleled in Greek. The whole first chapter of the Prolegomena, not less than forty pages, is devoted to a most careful analysis of the Prologue. Its results are: The Epistle of Aristeas preserves a nucleus of facts; one of these facts is, that both Demetrius of Phalerum and Ptolemy Philadelphus gave their countenance to the undertaking of a translation of the law for the Jews of the Dispersion. "The younger Ben Sira came to Egypt in the year 247 B.C., and

took part in the translation of the Wisdom Literature which was then proceeding. His contribution was probably more than the rendering of his grandfather's composition" (p. 271). With these assumptions it is interesting to compare what is said upon these points in Thackeray's recently published *Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint* (p. ix): "The versions of most of the 'Writings' [Books] (Psalms perhaps excluded) . . ." seem notwithstanding "the oft-quoted statement in the Prologue of Ben Sira, to belong to a period not earlier than the first century B.C." This difference shows how desirable a renewed study of these questions is. Hart has contributed a most reliable basis for such a study, and a powerful incitement thereto.

EBERHARD NESTLE

MAULBRONN, GERMANY

TORREY'S EZRA STUDIES

In 1896 Professor Torrey published an interesting and valuable pamphlet on *The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah*. In that monograph a pretty advanced position was taken, a position held for a time by a few foreign scholars, but from which the trend of critical opinion has turned back to greater conservatism. The author complains because his contentions have been so generally ignored by subsequent writers on these books. He cites case after case of scholars who have given no heed to his arguments; but he certainly has not given credit to all that have used his material. My article on "Ezra-Nehemiah" in Hastings' *Dictionary* was written before Torrey's work appeared; but in the later article on Nehemiah his views were stated so far as they were germane to the subject.

However lightly others have regarded the radical conclusions, Professor Torrey himself finds nothing to take back; for a recently published and considerable volume¹ is an amplification of the little pamphlet, and furnishes additional arguments for the position taken fourteen years ago.

The volume offers a great wealth of scholarly material, and reveals at every point the author's critical insight; but it is somewhat marred by an unpleasant dogmatism, and by a manifest impatience with those who seem to be blind to conclusions of which the author is so convinced. To cite a single example, he quotes from an article by von Orelli to the effect that the Chronicler revised the memoirs of Ezra to such an extent that they are marked by his peculiar style, and then adds, "but those who attempt this explanation show that they neither realize the extent of this revision nor have an acquaintance with the Chronicler's editorial methods" (p. 241).

¹ *Ezra Studies*. By Charles C. Torrey, professor of Semitic languages in Yale University. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1910. xv + 346 pages. \$1.69.